

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
WESTERN DISTRICT OF WASHINGTON  
AT TACOMA

PIERCE COUNTY REPUBLICAN  
PARTY,

Plaintiff,

v.

ERIC EUGENE CROWL,

Defendant.

CASE NO. C25-5251 BHS

ORDER

THIS MATTER is before the Court on pro se defendant Eric Crowl's "motion to protect material witness Lisa Olson," Dkt. 40. Crowl asks the Court to issue a Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 26(c) protective order restraining plaintiff Pierce County Republican Party "from further intimidating harassing or excluding Lisa Olson from party activities based on her status as a witness or her free association with defendant Crowl," and "directing PRCP to cease any actions that may be construed as witness tampering[.]" *Id.* at 3. He contends that plaintiff is punishing Olson for her association with him, and seeks to ensure that she can "testify without fear of reprisal." *Id.*

1 The motion is improper, and denied, for several reasons. First, as the Court  
2 previously explained, Crowl cannot represent any person or entity other than himself.  
3 Dkt. at 2–3. Second, Crowl has cited no authority for the relief he seeks on behalf of non-  
4 party Olson. His motion mentions but does not quote or discuss Rule 26(c), but he has  
5 cited no authority<sup>1</sup> for his requested relief. Nor has he shown that plaintiff is  
6 “intimidating” Olson. His motion essentially seeks a mandatory injunction requiring the  
7 Pierce County Republican Party to allow Olson to remain or become a member and to  
8 participate in its affairs. Even if Olson was a party and Crowl was her attorney, he has not  
9 shown that she is entitled to such an injunction, factually or legally.

10 The motion is wholly without merit and it is **DENIED**. Crowl is pro se, but he is  
11 subject to the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure, and the Local Rules for the Western  
12 District of Washington, including Rule 11. *See Ghazali v. Moran*, 46 F.3d 52, 54 (9th Cir.  
13 1995) (“Although we construe pleadings liberally in their favor, pro se litigants are bound  
14 by the rules of procedure.”).

15 **IT IS SO ORDERED.**

16 Dated this 17th day of July, 2025.

17 

18 BENJAMIN H. SETTLE  
19 United States District Judge

---

20 <sup>1</sup> Crowl’s nine-page reply, Dkt. 51, includes legal citations and more factual detail,  
21 but new arguments and evidence presented for the first time in a Reply are waived. See  
22 *DocuSign, Inc. v. Sertifi, Inc.*, 468 F.Supp.2d 1305, 1307 (W.D. Wash. 2006) (citing  
*United States v. Patterson*, 230 F.3d 1168, 1172 (9th Cir. 2000); and *Thompson v.*  
*Comm’r*, 631 F.2d 642, 649 (9th Cir. 1980)).